

Message

From: Adhar, Radha [Adhar.Radha@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/19/2021 7:00:45 PM
To: Fox, Radhika [Fox.Radhika@epa.gov]
CC: Cisar, Elizabeth [Cisar.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Lead Q

Got it! Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 19, 2021, at 2:54 PM, Fox, Radhika <Fox.Radhika@epa.gov> wrote:

This question is fine. Elizabeth see below

From: Adhar, Radha <Adhar.Radha@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 2:33 PM
To: Fox, Radhika <Fox.Radhika@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Lead Q

Hey lady are you good with this? Please let me know!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Suntag, Aaron (Stabenow)" <Aaron_Suntag@stabenow.senate.gov>
Date: October 19, 2021 at 2:14:42 PM EDT
To: "Adhar, Radha" <Adhar.Radha@epa.gov>
Subject: Lead Q

Let me know how this will be responded to....

Before turning to PFAS, I want ask you about the lead situation in the City of Benton Harbor, Michigan.

Some very troubling details have emerged about lead exceedances that date back a number of years in Benton Harbor, leading up to the October 6 decision by the State of Michigan to recommend residents use bottled water for cooking and drinking.

Last year, the EPA awarded a \$5.6 million grant to the City for removal of lead lines and an analysis of the City's corrosion control under a grant program that we established in the 2016 water infrastructure bill. Meanwhile, the Governor has announced future funding to replace all lead service lines in the City over the next 18 months.

How is EPA working with the City and the state to address lead contamination in the near- and long-terms? Are we making progress on the analysis of the City's corrosion control and the level of protection provided by water filters given to residents?

From: Adhar, Radha <Adhar.Radha@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:44 AM

To: Suntag, Aaron (Stabenow) <Aaron_Suntag@stabenow.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: PFAS Q

Thank you!

From: Suntag, Aaron (Stabenow) <Aaron_Suntag@stabenow.senate.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:36 AM

To: Adhar, Radha <Adhar.Radha@epa.gov>

Subject: PFAS Q

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Thank you for the leadership that EPA is showing on addressing PFAS.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->As we've discussed, Michigan has had significant challenges when it comes to working with the Defense Department to address PFAS contamination on and around military bases.
- PFAS has been detected on at least 10 bases in Michigan. At one base, we have had readings as high as 32,200 parts per trillion.
- And at some of our bases – such as Wurtsmith and Camp Grayling – we have PFAS migrating off base and into surrounding water bodies, causing PFAS-laden foam to develop on the water surfaces.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->On July 22, 2020, the State of Michigan finalized its own drinking and groundwater standards for numerous PFAS.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->It is my understanding that current federal law is pretty clear: in the absence of national drinking and groundwater standards, the Defense Department is to comply with state standards.
- Unfortunately, it doesn't seem like the Defense Department interprets statute like I do. I've had trouble getting a straight answer.
- So I ask you: **Do you agree that federal statute requires the Department of Defense to comply with state drinking and groundwater standards for**

PFAS if federal standards don't exist or a state has more stringent standards than a federal one?

- I'm pleased with the steps EPA has announced for addressing PFAS, including hard timelines for completing drinking water and cleanup standards, but I'm sure you can appreciate the concern we have about having to wait for these federal actions to be finalized before the Department of Defense addresses contamination it caused.

Aaron Suntag
Senior Policy Advisor
Office of Senator Debbie Stabenow
731 Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
202.224.4822